

Illinois U Library

OCTOBER 26, 1948

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

BROADCAST BY STATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.



Reg. U.S. Pat. Off.

g. U.S. Pat. Off.

What Hope for Europe?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

Speakers

H. V. KALTENBORN

NORMAN COUSINS

WILLIAM L. SHIRER

PAUL MANNING

(See also page 12)

COMING

—November 2, 1948—

Town Meeting not to be broadcast because of election returns

—November 9, 1948—

What Should We Do About Race Segregation?

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N.Y.

VOLUME 14, NUMBER 27



\$4.50 A YEAR: 10¢ A COPY



CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF OCTOBER 26:

"What Hope for Europe?"

<i>Mr.</i> DENNY	3
<i>Mr.</i> KALTENBORN	4
<i>Mr.</i> MANNING	6
<i>Mr.</i> SHIRER	8
<i>Mr.</i> COUSINS	10
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN	12
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!	13



THE BROADCAST OF NOVEMBER 2:

No Town Meeting Broadcast because of election returns



THE BROADCAST OF NOVEMBER 9:

"What Should We Do About Race Segregation?"



The Broadcast-Telecast of October 26, 1948, originated in Town Hall, New York City, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., EST, over the American Broadcasting Co. Network.

Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. **Send Subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N. Y.** Subscription price, \$4.50 a year, 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Illinois U Library Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR



OCTOBER 26, 1948

VOL. 14, No. 27

What Hope for Europe?

Announcer:

Yes, friends, it's Town Meeting time, and time for you Town Meeting fans from coast to coast to call up one of your friends you think might not be listening and tell him or her about tonight's program. Four outstanding foreign correspondents are about to discuss the most urgent question of the moment, perhaps the most crucial question before the world today—the conflict between East and West in Berlin.

Are we heading for another World War?

Will America and the Western democracies succeed with the Marshall Plan? Or, will Russia and her satellites defeat it?

What does this present crisis mean to you and me here and now?

In the interests of good citizenship and promoting an understanding of the great issues before us today, we invite you to be a modern Town Crier and keep your friends informed about your Town

Meeting, built each week in response to your suggestions.

Now to preside over our discussion, here is our moderator, the President of Town Hall, New York, and founder of America's Town Meeting of the Air, Mr. George V. Denny, Jr., Mr. Denny. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors. Every day the conflict between East and West in Europe has been increasing in intensity, and many people are wondering how long we can keep it up without going to war. Yesterday the Russians vetoed the compromise plan for a Berlin settlement put before the Security Council by the small nations.

The Western democracies have decided now to let public opinion develop before taking further action. So we here tonight are presenting this program in the interests of an enlightened public opinion.

Berlin, as you know, is an is-

land in the center of a Soviet zone—a Soviet sea. The representatives of four of the former Allies—Russia, Britain, France, and the United States—are the arrow points in the cold war between East and West.

As the former capital of Germany, Berlin is the symbol of the conflict, but the Ruhr Valley and perhaps the rest of Europe is its substance. Today the smoke of industry hangs heavily over Western Germany.

Is the Ruhr the real goal of the men in the Kremlin, or will they stop there?

What are their objectives in France, now almost paralyzed by a strike of the French coal miners, encouraged and abetted by the Communists?

What are their objectives in Italy?

Will the Marshall Plan and stepped up military preparedness check the communist advance in Europe?

Even if this present crisis passes, what next?

What hope is there for Europe today? To help us understand this question, we've invited four of America's leading foreign correspondents and writers who recently returned from the scene of the conflict: H. V. Kaltenborn, Paul Manning, William L. Shirer, and Norman Cousins.

We hear first from the man who is known as the dean of American radio commentators, because he's

been in the business since 1922 and has appeared frequently on this platform, Mr. H. V. Kaltenborn. Mr. Kaltenborn. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Kaltenborn:

The communist threat is still Europe's chief concern. The Moscow infection continues to slow down recovery. Everywhere the Red menace cripples reconstruction. Yesterday we had the twenty-seventh veto.

Governments have been unable to bring their peoples back to a normal way of life because of the communist disease at home, plus the Russian threat from outside. Postwar recovery is always difficult, but during the last war, Central Europe was more completely destroyed, physically and morally, than at any time since the Thirty Years War. Small wonder that only three years after the war is ended, we still ask: "What Hope for Europe?"

Incurable optimists, like my friend, Norman Cousins, here, may still think that a world government about which we dream can do more than an imperfect United Nations which we can improve. I, myself, see little hope, unless Western Europe grows strong enough to face the dual menace of communist sabotage and Russian expansion.

So far, the major victories have been won by the Kremlin. Russia has extended her domination over eleven European countries.

When the Kremlin reached out for Iran, Greece, and Turkey, and took over Czechoslovakia, the Western world finally realized that Stalin had replaced Hitler as the new world menace.

Even Bill Shirer, with whom I have repeatedly debated the Russian problem on this platform, will, I feel sure, no longer underestimate the communist danger.

The United States added its strength to Western Europe just in time to halt the Russian threat before it reached the Persian oil fields and the Mediterranean.

Now, we have the cold war which absorbs the strength and resources of Europe's war-weary people. There can be no normal recovery while it lasts.

Look at the picture. Berlin is besieged, Russia's armies and agents seek to squeeze the Western powers out of the German capital. Yet, they are in Berlin both by right of conquest and by right of agreement, and they propose to stay there.

Because of the cold war, neither Austria nor Germany can be unified.

Look at France. The Communist party, which represents thirty percent of her electorate, is sabotaging the recovery so well begun under the Marshall Plan. The communist leadership of France proudly announces that the destructive coal strike is costing France two million American dollars a day.

A few weeks ago I began my conversation with Pope Pius by congratulating him upon the defeat of the Communists in the Italian elections. He replied: "The Communists have not been defeated. We have won a skirmish, not a victory. We continue to face a serious Red menace."

That same thought, of the ever-present communist danger, was impressed upon me all over Europe. Every one of our Marshall Plan representatives—Harriman, Bruce, Zellerbach, Finletter—explained to me how the Red menace handicaps the Marshall Plan recovery. Sometimes, as in France, crippling Communist-led strikes reduce production to bring destructive inflation.

Sometimes the communist threat is used by European cabinets to avoid the strong measures needed to balance budgets and stabilize currencies. Europe's self-help will soon be much more important than Marshall Plan help.

In Czechoslovakia, I saw with my own eyes how the dead hand of communist control cripples production and steadily reduces the standard of living. Paul Manning who was also behind the Iron Curtain, will confirm these observations.

To one who lives in freedom, it is heart-breaking to witness the creeping terror now enslaving the once-free people of Czechoslovakia.

Certainly, there is no hope for

Europeans who live under communism. If we permit communism to absorb Europe and turn Europe against us, we will have to spend ten times more on armament than we are spending on the Marshall Plan.

We are committed by ties of common interest to do our best to save Europe. We can probably do it without war, if we remain ready to do it with war.

We have three powerful weapons, with which we can win the cold war: (1) a firm defensive alliance of the free nations of Europe; (2) a new agreement to supply arms to our European allies; (3) the continuation of Marshall Plan aid.

I saw for myself that the ERP machine is becoming more unified and more efficient everyday. For the first time in history, Europe is moving toward economic unity. Sixteen European powers have begun to work together. Five have already developed a firm military alliance for defense.

All Europe has begun to think and talk about the United States of Europe. Today, on this platform, we naturally emphasize the problems that obscure our hopes, but with time and patient sacrifice, the problems can be solved; the hope remains. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Kaltenborn. Our next speaker has some definite proposals to make in the light of

the conditions described by Mr. Kaltenborn, so let's hear now from Paul Manning, also a distinguished author and foreign correspondent, a familiar voice to radio listeners, who has just returned from a first-hand view of Europe, where he interviewed leaders and the commonfolk alike. Paul Manning. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Manning:

I very much agree with Mr. Kaltenborn that Europe must be strong. I would even go a step further. I would, within the limits of national security, send the very latest weapons to our associates in Western Europe. It's for our own protection, and it is Europe's only hope for the future.

Europe's future lies in strength. She must have weapons and a firm military alliance with America. Nothing less than a sweeping military alliance binding the American powers with non-communist Europe can give Western Europe the security she needs.

It is a fact that military power and foreign policy are inseparably linked. The West lost sight of this in 1945, but the Russians never overlooked it.

In every foreign capital I visited recently, I sensed a fear of Soviet aggression. Fear of Russia dominates French politics. Fear of Russia colors the thinking of all Europe. There can be no real recovery under the Marshall Plan unless strength and hope supersede fear.

A successful and strong Western Europe, with a rising standard of living, will not only be able to withstand Soviet pressure, but will have a strong attraction for the once free nations of Middle Europe, who also like to eat, for if the West becomes strong again, there is still hope for these peoples. In fact, I may say that the most hopeless peoples I encountered were those people who live under Soviet domination.

One Austrian businessman told me that life under Soviet domination was life without hope. A journey that I made through the Soviet Zone bore out his statement. I saw towns and villages paralyzed by Soviet rule. People neither laughed nor smiled. There was a grave sombreness to everything they did.

In contrast to the farm and factory successes of the West, farm production under Soviet direction was on a starvation level and factory output had become a mere trickle. Russia has neither the ability nor the administrative manpower to place her areas of conquest on a self-sustaining basis.

Indeed, I may say that the Soviets have one great ability, if you can call it that, and that is to clamp down a crude police state wherever they go. But that is a negative ability, which paralyzes and ultimately destroys.

To prevent this from happening throughout all Europe, the non-communist nations of the West

must be militarily strong, they must be able to resist Soviet aggressions from outside their borders, as well as from within.

In Paris recently, I talked with the most powerful man in France, Charles de Gaulle, and he told me that American aid to Europe must be strategic as well as economic if the continent is to survive.

In Berlin, General Lucius D. Clay told me that the Marshall Plan cannot help but succeed providing there is peace in Europe. That is the unknown factor. Until the Marshall Plan gets into full operation, until there is a strong military union to protect the fruits of the Marshall Plan, there cannot be that confidence which is essential to Europe's victory.

In London, I also talked to many people, to soldiers and airmen I had known intimately in the war, to diplomats and leaders, and to just plain ordinary people. All of them are plagued by many things these days — severe rationing, a crushing bureaucracy which is the inevitable result of an overplanned economy and, of course, by the threat of another war.

There is disunity on domestic policies in Britain and yet everywhere there is this one agreement that only a strong West can check further Soviet aggressions. I am certain that America can never persuade the present rulers of Russia to make a settled peace by friendliness and good deeds alone.

Stalin himself believes that

eventually all roads lead to communism and that communism can be established only by force. This, indeed, is the basic principle of communism, for Stalin's whole career is a synthesis of this belief. This is his character; it is the character of his government and regime.

The answer to it all lies in ourselves. We have to counter intensive strength by building up our own intensive strength until Europe gets on its feet. We must have a North Atlantic security pact. In this direction, lies the real hope of Europe. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Paul Manning, for those definite suggestions. Now a Town Meeting on this question would be incomplete without Bill Shirer. Mr. Shirer has just returned from a trip to Europe. He's the author, as you know, of *Berlin Diary* and *End of a Berlin Diary*. Step up, William Shirer. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Shirer:

Mr. Denny, ladies and gentlemen, I don't feel as pessimistic as Mr. Manning and especially my old friend, Mr. Kaltenborn. I think there's considerable hope for Europe and, especially, I mean for Western Europe.

From what I saw of it recently, I gather that the European's hope was based on three premises: (1) that economic recovery based not only on our American help,

but on self-help will continue; (2) that the British and American governments will have the sense to see to it that the Ruhr produces for the general European good and not just for the German good (*applause*) and that the same old Germany that provoked two World Wars is not put back on its feet by us (*applause*), and (3) that there is no war over Berlin or Germany, or over anything else. (*Applause.*)

Let us consider briefly these three points. Despite the efforts of Russia and the various Communist parties dominated by Russia to torpedo the Marshall Plan, it is succeeding. Western Europe is producing more than before the war and more than last year.

You and I read about strikes over there and about "those lazy Europeans" not working and about our American money going down the drain. In Paris, the other day, I took time off to get some facts. I hope it's not subversive in the eyes of the Thomas Committee but I'll leave it to you whether they provide hope for Europe.

This year's harvest of vital bread grains in Western Europe is 44 per cent higher than last year. It's just about equal to the prewar average and it means that with a little help from us, Europeans this winter for the first time in nearly ten years will have enough to eat.

The factories of Western Europe increased their production, during

the first half of this year, 17 per cent over last year. A year ago, they had surpassed prewar levels.

France, despite her strikes and strife that we read about in our papers, boosted her industrial production during the first six months of this year 18 per cent; the Netherlands 13 per cent; Norway, 12; United Kingdom, 11.

Steel production in Western Europe is even greater than planned. This year it will turn out 11 million more tons than last year, a total of 45 millions tons which is three times Russian production.

Those are some of the facts about European self-help and they give hope to Europe and they promise relief to you and me, to American taxpayers.

In Western Germany, of course, economic recovery is even more sensational. This year alone, production there has jumped 26 per cent. Steel production in Western Germany is up to 7 million tons a year, which is about what Germany needed for her peaceful pursuits. We're building up Germany fast. The only trouble is, I fear, we're also building up the same old Germany, the same old Germans, who messed the world up in two World Wars. (*Applause.*)

And now, we're trying to cheat our allies out of reparations. That, of course, isn't the only cloud, the big cloud is the fear of war. Mr. Manning and Mr. Kaltenborn have stressed that Western

Europe's only hope lies in becoming militarily strong. That may be, but the question is can she afford both the Marshall Plan and drastic rearmament.

Can we afford it? Can we afford five billions more for European rearmament on top of five billions under the Marshall plan? Have we got it?

Obviously, a war would destroy hope for Western Europe, as it will destroy hope for all of us. But I must say this that I found the Europeans less jittery about war than our good folk here at home and therein lies the answer to our question tonight, "What Hope for Europe?" It is based on more than just increased production of factories and farms. It's based on a belief in and a will for peace. Thank you. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Bill Shirer. I'm beginning to think my friend Norman Cousins, our next speaker is trying to equal the record for traveling of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt. He travels all over the country on lecture tours in the wintertime, he goes West and East in the summer. A short time ago he went to the South Seas—to Bikini to be exact—and broadcast from over there. He's just returned from Germany, broadcasting on the air lift planes, and he served with Arthur Garfield Hays and Roger Baldwin of the Civil Liberties Union on a committee set up by

General Clay to investigate the record of the military on civil and political liberties.

Well, Mr. Cousins, we welcome your view on tonight's question. Norman, step up. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Cousins:

Mr. Denny, I have been making some notes here, particularly during the talks of Mr. Kaltenborn and Mr. Manning and I hope you don't mind if I turn away from my own prepared script to take up some of the points they raised.

I confess I was disturbed by the fact that not once during the talks of Mr. Kaltenborn and Mr. Manning did I hear a single mention of the United Nations. Nor did I hear a single mention of the fact that the best hope for Europe lies in a vastly strengthened United Nations. (*Applause.*)

What we have heard tonight are the old and outworn arguments, I'm afraid—the peace through power politics, peace through defensive alliances, peace through balance of power, peace through bigger and better armaments—in fact, all the arguments which throughout history have failed to avert war.

And that, Mr. Denny, I submit as the chief difference between Mr. Kaltenborn, Mr. Manning, and myself. They are concerned about winning the next war. I am concerned, yes, even at this late date, I am concerned about averting the next war. (*Applause.*)

I'm concerned about averting it knowing what the next war will mean and believing deeply that the human race has exhausted its margin for error and that we haven't yet come anywhere near putting the same amount of energy into planning for peace as we have into planning for war. (*Applause.*)

I kept listening as Mr. Manning and Mr. Kaltenborn spoke for a real definition of hope, not only for Europe, but hope for all of us, hope for Europeans and Americans, and Africans, and Chinese, and Indians, for we cannot separate Europe from the world anymore than we can separate the world from Europe.

I kept listening for the thing I believe that people everywhere are waiting to hear—waiting to hear that the time has come to seek peace by setting up a rule of law in the world; that the time has come for the United States to propose to all nations, in good faith, that we can win the peace only through a vast strengthening of the United Nations—giving the UN superior police powers over any state in the world, giving it the power to regulate armaments, giving it the power to deal with aggressive nations, giving it the machinery of government, in short.

The time has come for the nations of the world to put up or shut up about the UN, and I would like to see our own country on the putting up side. (*Applause.*)

About a month ago, I was lucky enough to make the round trip several times in the air lift between Frankfort and Berlin in one of the flying coal trucks, an operation which I am sure has impressed the Russians even more than it has impressed the Germans.

You know a voyage through the air corridor to Berlin is an experience that you're not apt to forget very easily. Taking off at Frankfort with 20,000 pounds of coal on a split second runway schedule, speeding out on the runway past dozens of four-motor planes in preparation for take-off, flying low and seeing a long caravan of army eight-wheeled coal trucks stretching as far as the eye can see, flying over Soviet military installations, approaching the skeletonized city of Berlin which looks from the air about the way a toy village would look if you ran a truck over it, coming down at Templehof and seeing the incredible activity, new runways being built, bulldozers, snorting and throwing their weight around, jeeps darting in and out like nervous mosquitoes, giant planes lining up for the take-off at intervals of only three minutes.

Now seeing all this gives you a feeling of prodigious awe for what the human race is capable of doing once it sets its mind to it. And yet that very fact bothers you, bothers you deeply. When it comes to anything involving machines or technical coordination,

man is superb, but when it comes to the job that really counts, the making of peace, the making of a free world, we don't do nearly so well.

One night, walking through Berlin, walking through a dead city and looking up and seeing the jagged, solitary walls of brick still standing as monuments to catastrophe, I wondered whether Americans realize that day by day, the momentum is building up for another war and that the tensions are spiralling and that what is happening in the world is no longer a giant chess game but a fantastic game of chance in which the momentum is more important than the deliberate moves of the players, a momentum in which accidents can happen, accidents that can trigger an explosion which may be the culminating disgrace through six thousand years of what we like to call civilization.

When you think about all this, you find it impossible to understand why this Nation, our Nation, has failed to recognize that peace cannot be had by negotiating for it across the table from Russia or by maneuvering for it inside a weak United Nations organization, but only by doing the things that should have been done three years ago at San Francisco —giving the UN real ginger, giving it real rules to enforce and the means of enforcing them; in short, giving the United Nations the powers of government.

That is why I feel, Mr. Denny, that any talk of hope for Europe, or hope for any of us, must be built not around the combustible idea of a military offensive, but around a grand moral and psychological offensive, around a design for living under world law. (Applause.)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Norman Cousins. This is the time when we usually have our huddle around the microphone, but since this is not a debate and we're largely interested in getting across an understanding of this question with the aid of these foreign correspondents and

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

HANS V. KALTENBORN — Dean of radio commentators, H. V. Kaltenborn made his first news broadcast in 1922. Born in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Mr. Kaltenborn was graduated from Harvard in 1909 with an A.B. cum laude. Since then, he has received several honorary degrees. For twenty years, 1910-1930, he was associated with the *Brooklyn Eagle*. In 1930, he left the *Eagle* for WABC, key station for the Columbia network. Since 1940, he has been with the National Broadcasting Company. Mr. Kaltenborn has been radio reporter for many political conventions, League of Nations sessions, Pan American Peace Conferences, and the like. His honors and citations for meritorious radio reporting are too numerous to mention. He was awarded a gold plaque for the best foreign radio reporting covering the Spanish front in 1936, when he made possible the first radio transmission of artillery and machine-gun fire during actual combat. Mr. Kaltenborn is the author of several books and many magazine articles. Among his books are *We Look at the World*, *Kaltenborn Edits the News* and *I Broadcast the Crisis*. Mr. Kaltenborn, who has traveled widely, has a knowledge of several foreign languages including French, German, and Italian. During the past summer he traveled extensively in Europe.

WILLIAM LAWRENCE SHIRER — Author and radio commentator, Mr. Shirer was born in Chicago in 1904. While attending Coe College in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, he was sports editor of a newspaper. Following graduation, Mr. Shirer went to New York, but was unable to find a job. He sailed for Europe where he obtained a position in the Paris Office of the *Chicago Tribune*.

After a year, Mr. Shirer became foreign correspondent for the *Tribune* and for the next six years the Continent was his beat. From 1929 to 1932, he was chief of the *Tribune's* European Bureau with headquarters in Vienna. In 1930

and 1931, he spent some time in India and Afghanistan. He became a friend and admirer of Gandhi.

From 1935 to 1937, Mr. Shirer was foreign correspondent for the Universal News Service. From 1937 until 1940, when his anti-Nazi broadcasts made things too hot for him in Germany, he was Continental representative for the Columbia Broadcasting System. Returning to America, Mr. Shirer wrote his best seller, *Berlin Diary*. For some time, he was heard regularly over the American Broadcasting Company Network. In 1946, he was awarded the George Foster Peabody award for outstanding radio reporting and interpretation of the news. Mr. Shirer has just recently returned from Europe.

NORMAN COUSINS — After his graduation in 1933 from Teachers College, Columbia University, Mr. Cousins became an editorial writer for the *New York Post*. After one year at this job he joined the staff of *Current History* where he stayed for five years as literary editor and managing editor. In 1940 he became executive editor of the *Saturday Review of Literature*, and since June, 1942, has been editor. In 1934, Mr. Cousins was appointed publication consultant and editor of "U.S.A." of the Office of War Information. In addition to his magazine writing, Mr. Cousins is the author of *The Good Inheritance*, *The Democratic Chance*, and *Modern Man Is Obsolete*.

Mr. Cousins recently returned from Europe where he had been at the invitation of General Lucius Clay to investigate civil and political liberties in Berlin.

PAUL MANNING — Author, radio commentator, and foreign correspondent, Mr. Manning returned last month from a trip to England, France, Germany, and Austria. While abroad he interviewed General Charles de Gaulle, General Lucius D. Clay, and Prime Minister Clement R. Attlee.

commentators, we're going into the question period immediately. While we get ready for that question period, I'm sure you, our listeners, will be interested in the following message.

Announcer:

You are listening to the 532nd broadcast of America's Town Meeting originating tonight in Town Hall, New York. We're discussing the question "What Hope for Europe?" You have just heard H. V. Kaltenborn, Paul Manning, William Shirer, and Norman Cousins, and now we're about to take questions from the audience.

For your convenience, Town Hall prints each week a complete text of Town Meeting, including the questions and answers that follow, in the Town Meeting Bulletin. Copies of tonight's broadcast, as well as past and future programs may be secured by writing to Town Hall, New York 18, New York, and enclosing ten cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing.

If you'd like to subscribe to the Town Hall Bulletin for six months, enclose just \$2.35; for a year, send \$4.50; or if you'd like a trial subscription, enclose \$1 for 11 issues.

The question period which follows is completely spontaneous and unrehearsed. In order to discard irrelevant and useless questions, members of the audience are asked to write their questions in 25 words on a card and send them back to an assistant moderator by one of the ushers. If the question is approved, the usher returns it, and during the question period, the questioner holds up one, two, three, or four fingers to indicate to the moderator to whom his question is directed. This is to keep from having too many questions for the same speaker.

The big parabolic microphones on either side of the stage and the television cameras are being trained on the questioner Mr. Denny will recognize first. Now for the question period.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Man: Is it possible to bring about a European revival without some degree of socialism and without preventing the cartel interests from returning to power?

Mr. Denny: I believe he signalled his question to Mr. Kaltenborn.

Mr. Kaltenborn: I do not believe it is possible to bring about European revival without some degree of socialism, interpreting that term as broadly as I understand it. I certainly do not believe it is necessary to revive the European cartels.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman over here in the center.

Man: I address my remark to Mr. Shirer. Paul Hoffman has implied the slackening of the Marshall aid to England if she socializes steel. King George asked for this today. What is the United States position?

Mr. Denny: Do you know the United States position?

Mr. Shirer: I haven't been told this, but I guess that we would let the British handle the steel as they wish to. I think that is a very good policy.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now the lady over here, please.

Lady: Mr. Cousins, can 20th Century problems be settled by 18th Century methods, military armament, military alliances, and costly armament which have always led to new wars and economic ruins?

Mr. Denny: We appreciate that but do you remember our 25-word limit? I kept thinking about that as you were talking. Mr. Cousins, do you have the question?

Mr. Cousins: I don't know whether I got the question. Do you have the question, George?

Mr. Denny: I think she said can modern disputes be settled with old-fashioned 18th Century methods?

Mr. Cousins: I don't think so.

Mr. Denny: All right, Mr. Kaltenborn has a comment.

Mr. Kaltenborn: I don't consider that armaments are 18th

Century methods. I consider that in a world where we confront the largest land army in the world devoted to the Communist cause, we would be fools if we did not have 20th Century armaments. I noticed that even Mr. Cousins, in challenging me, expressed the greatest enthusiasm about what the American air force is doing in the Berlin airlift. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Cousins: I agree with you Mr. Kaltenborn. You see I am arguing in favor of a double-barreled American foreign policy—one which decides on strength but at the same time recognizes that our greatest strength is this moral and political offensive I was talking about. You can only have peace through world law. I am concerned about the fact that we may have to use these weapons. As I said before, we must be strong. We must also be strong on the matter of foreign policy.

Mr. Denny: Now this gentleman on the aisle here.

Man: Mr. Manning, do you think that unless De Gaulle is elected to power, France will turn Communist?

Mr. Manning: I think not necessarily, but I do believe that he would certainly assist in the better organization of France today. He would bring a little organization to the chaos that now exists.

Mr. Denny: All right, now any other comments on that? Mr. Shirer, I notice you feeling rather

uncomfortable in your chair on that answer.

Mr. Shirer: Well, it does make me feel uncomfortable because the chief impression I brought back from Paris a couple weeks ago was that if DeGaulle came back to power, he'd get civil war. I think that's something we all should know about before we get so enthusiastic about bringing De Gaulle back to power. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: That's a very important question Mr. Manning. You'd better come back and defend yourself.

Mr. Manning: I think we should have talked to the same people because I got the very definite impression that there wouldn't be civil war, and if De Gaulle came back, he would just bring France further along the road to recovery.

Mr. Denny: All right. There are two views on the De Gaulle question. Any other comments or should we take the next question from the lady right down here?

Lady: Mr. Shirer, if the Russians withdraw their troops from Eastern Germany as suggested by the press, won't we be compelled to do the same thing or lose face?

Mr. Shirer: That's the argument Mr. Lippman has been advocating. My own personal opinion is "no." If the Russians get out, we can say "That's fine, but we're going to stay awhile." I'm afraid that if we got out, in the first place, we'd have to go much

further than the Russians would go from the borders of Germany —we would have to come home here. In the second place, if the Allies leave Germany, you'd better get ready for another German war.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Cousins, did you indicate that you want to speak here?

Mr. Cousins: I believe the Russians are also training 300,000 German police. As a test of Russian sincerity, I suppose Russia would also have to say that she is disarming the police in addition to getting out of Germany with her own arms.

Mr. Denny: All right. Next question; the gentleman in the center aisle here.

Man: My question is addressed to Mr. Kaltenborn. Do you believe that ERP is helping to establish the democratic regime that the people of Europe really want, or are we establishing the type of government that will be most beneficial for our State Department's maneuvers?

Mr. Kaltenborn: I resent "State Department maneuvers" because our State Department is carrying out a legitimate American policy approved by the American people. (*Applause.*) In the second place, I am convinced that ERP is promoting European recovery and it is devoting itself to economic purposes and is steering as far away from any political pressure as it possibly can.

Therefore, I believe that your question suggests a line of policy which is far from the purposes of the State Department which is carrying out the intention of the American people on a bipartisan foreign policy. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman over on the aisle.

Man: I'd like to direct this question to Mr. Manning. How can we avoid this chaos when the foundation has already been laid for destruction by the Socialistic party, for in the beginning, its members have been holding key positions within their own countries?

Mr. Manning: I don't know what the man means. What chaos?

Man: The chaos of industry, the chaos that has come forth with the Marshall plan, and numerous others.

Mr. Manning: It is my impression that the chaos is being "un-chaosed" if I may say that by the very application of the Marshall plan. It's bringing substance and order out of chaos.

Man: We're not buying peace and people. That's not settling the problem. Buying people is another thing.

Mr. Manning: On the contrary, I think you confuse something. You must realize one basic fact. Hunger is the man-servant of Communism and, if you do away with hunger, then the people of Europe won't go Communist.

Man: It's like feeding a baby a bottle. (*Applause and laughter.*)

Mr. Shirer: That question reminds me of a misunderstanding that I think most of us Americans have. That is that the Marshall plan is paying all the bills, that we are feeding the baby as the gentleman said a moment ago. I think it might be interesting to point out to ourselves that the Marshall Plan accounts for 5 percent of Europe's trade. It is an important 5 percent, but self-help accounts for 95 percent. We're not completely feeding the baby. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: The gentleman on the center aisle.

Man: My question is to Mr. Kaltenborn. Russia, in the Communist form, in the United Nations, in every way except militarily, is waging war on us. When do we start to fight back? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Kaltenborn: We are already engaged in what has been called the "cold war." It seems to me we are fighting back very successfully in maintaining the air lift in Berlin.

We're fighting back, from the propaganda point of view, by use of the Voice of America.

We're fighting back economically through the Marshall plan.

We are fighting back—preparing to fight back militarily, if we must—by a very fine program of preparedness, in the course of which American people have accepted conscription in time of peace. We are not standing still, we are fighting back. Because we

ight back with the weapons of peace and with the weapons of preparedness, we are fairly sure of not having to fight back with the weapons of war. (Applause.)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman in the balcony over there.

Man: Mr. Shirer. Why has the influence of the United States in Greece and Turkey been more effective in keeping the Russian influence weaker than it has in Western Europe?

Mr. Denny: Is it a fact? And, if so, why?

Mr. Shirer: I think our influence in building up Western Europe economically is infinitely more important and more effective than the job we've done in Greece. I might say here that the Western Europeans today are making twice or three times as much steel as the Russians, and they are now getting the basis, if it should come to war, for armaments.

I would not agree that we have been very effective in Greece. Of course, that's a personal opinion.

Mr. Denny: The gentleman over on the other aisle.

Man: I am a student from Berlin, Germany. I should like to ask Mr. Cousins whether he considers it wise to continue military government in Germany?

Mr. Cousins: Absolutely. (Applause.)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now, the gentleman over here who is eager to ask Mr. Shirer a question.

Man: My question is directed to Mr. Shirer. Why give Americans false hope about Europe's capacity to feed itself when William Vogt, author of *Road to Survival*, made it clear only last week at the Herald Tribune Forum that Europe's steadily increasing over-population makes that ultimately quite impossible? (Applause.)

Mr. Shirer: I could say also that what he said held good for the whole world, as you will recall yourself, and as he makes clear in his book. The increase of population over food supply is a world problem. It's a very great problem in Asia. It's a great problem in certain countries of South America. It's a problem we're facing, too.

I'm merely saying that European food production is approximately back to where it was before the war, and it's 44 per cent higher this year than it was last, which means, as I tried to make clear, that for the first time, since about the beginning of the war, the Europeans, along with the help that we're going to give them this year, are going to have enough to eat.

Now, maybe in 50 years or 100 years, if something doesn't happen to this erosion and increase of population, Mr. Vogt will be right. But I'm thinking in terms of these five years, because if we can get them fed and get them back on their feet, we're going to have that peace that we all want.

I think that's a very important thing.

Mr. Denny: Yes, conservation, sir, is a very interesting subject, and we'll take that up sometime. Tonight we are talking about the immediate future, as Mr. Shirer pointed out. Now the young lady over there. Yes?

Lady: My question is directed to Mr. Kaltenborn. Do you believe in the policy that the United States should help only those countries which are not Communist, or do you believe we should help all countries?

Mr. Kaltenborn: It's an extremely interesting question as to whether or not, and to what extent, we should help Communist countries like Czechoslovakia. I pondered that very carefully after I visited the Skoda works in Czechoslovakia and found how keen they were to import some machine tools from the United States.

I would answer the question by saying, "I would, to a certain extent, maintain trade relations with the satellite countries of the Soviet Union. I would supply them with everything except direct raw materials, but I would be careful not to do it in sufficient quantity to be a material factor in case there should be war.

I think it is important that we maintain relations with them, that we give them hope, that we are ready to cooperate with them, provided they do not completely co-

operate with the Soviet Union. Czechoslovakia, from the trade point of view, still looks to the West and not to the East.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman over here with the red tie. It's too bad television doesn't pick up color yet.

Man: My question is addressed to Mr. Shirer. Mr. Shirer, in your hunt for facts in Europe, did you know whether or not countries in Eastern Europe achieve the same degree of recovery without the Marshall aid as those in Western Europe?

Mr. Shirer: I did not get to Eastern Europe on this trip, and therefore, I didn't go after the same figures that I did in Western Europe. I believe that the answer is that they have failed to achieve the amount of recovery in the East that they have in the West. Certainly Poland has achieved something, and Yugoslavia until the Russians turned against her. But I believe as Mr. Kaltenborn said a moment ago, these countries are hungry today for trade with the West, which would help their prosperity a great deal, and they're not getting it.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. I'm just a sucker for red. There's a girl with a beautiful red hat. Do you have a question?

Lady: My question is directed to Norman Cousins. Mr. Cousins, do you think Henry Wallace's program is sound foreign policy? (Laughter and applause.)

Mr. Denny: We've got Mr. Wallace in the discussion, now. We tried to get him on the air, but he, nor any of the other presidential candidates would accept.

Mr. Cousins: I'd like to try to answer that by telling you something I happened to see in France and Italy, and elsewhere in Europe. I think—and this is, perhaps, tragic—that the chief items of Soviet propaganda in Europe, today, are drawn from the speeches of Henry Wallace. In France, outside plants, I saw leaflets being distributed quoting from Henry Wallace. You see, Wallace is being used abroad in a role that he does not envision for himself. He sees himself as the bridge between East and West and his speeches say that and he lashes out against those who, as he says, would incite us to war against the Soviets. Yet in Europe they are using Mr. Wallace's speeches to incite war hatred against the United States.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now, we'll go for the little girl in the blue jacket.

Lady: My question is addressed to Mr. Manning. If we send arms to Europe, how can we be sure the people are willing to go to war with the United States against Russia?

Mr. Denny: If we send arms to Europe, how can we be sure that the people there will go to war with the United States, did you say?

Lady: Yes.

Mr. Denny: Against Russia. If we want them to, that's what you mean?

Mr. Manning: Well, as far as I can see, the United States and the countries of Western Europe are the last bulwark against slavery. It's slavery or civilization, and I'm quite sure that they are still for civilization and they always will be.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The lady on this aisle.

Lady: I go to Dalton School and my question is to Mr. Shirer. I understand that the production rates in Europe are very favorable, but could you tell me what you believe the hope for the next generation is? (Laughter.)

Mr. Shirer: Well, as a matter of fact, I like your question, not only because it's a good question, but because of the school where my own children go—the Dalton School. I found that despite the ruins, say in Berlin or Frankfort, or despite what these youngsters of your age have been through they have by no means given up hope for the future. When you talk with people of your age in France in their own language and, in German, with the Germans, you'll find that youth is wonderful because they do really believe that they've got a future, and I think they're right.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now, in the center aisle, here.

Man: Mr. Kaltenborn, what is the real issue in the Berlin dis-

pote? Is it really a question of Western marks or Soviet marks?

Mr. Kaltenborn: The question you cite was the final issue on which the conference split. It split on it in Moscow. It split on it again in Berlin. However, that is merely one of quite a number of issues that divided the powers of the East from those of the West. I think that, as often happens, a war is caused by one particular thing, but there are many things that lead up to it.

The currency issue is used by Russia to get economic and political control of Berlin. For that reason, it has a much larger importance than appears on the surface. Because Russia refused to permit the Four Power Finance Commission, that was understood to be agreed upon in the Stalin conversation, because the Russian commander in Berlin refused to accept that, undoubtedly on orders from the Kremlin, the conference broke up. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Anybody else like to comment on that? The gentleman over on the other aisle.

Man: Mr. Manning, I believe that hope for Europe must come from within Western Europe. Is there any indication that Western Europe would fight for her own freedom?

Mr. Manning: Yes, there is every indication possible but it's absolutely useless to fight a police state without any weapons.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. *Mr. Denny:* These people are answering the questions beautifully and briefly. We're getting a lot of questions tonight. The lady on the center aisle.

Lady: My question is addressed to Mr. Cousins. Do I understand, sir, that you would change the UN into a world government? How do you propose uniting a basically divided world?

Mr. Denny: How do you propose to unite a basically divided world? That was a good question, but a little fast.

Mr. Cousins: An extremely good question. I think it goes to the heart of the matter, and that is this: Will the Russians accept the United States' proposal of a world government? I don't know. Let's propose world government and find out. It's the one thing we haven't yet done. We haven't yet proposed to strengthen the UN.

On the contrary, the Secretary of State, only three months ago, appearing before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, said that the United States would be unwilling to see the veto abolished because we wanted the veto for our own protection. Now what kind of hypocrisy is this? What kind of double talk is this? (*Applause.*)

Before this country can raise questions about the veto or point to other nations, we have to know exactly where we stand. I don't think world government can be

jected until it is proposed. That why I think that we, the American people, have the decision to take right here. I think we should propose it. (Applause.)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Kaltenborn has something to say that.

Mr. Kaltenborn: I'm perfectly willing to agree with Mr. Cousins that world government is most desirable and admirable. However, we completely disagree that the mere proposal of world government by the United States would make the slightest difference in the present situation. He said that I had not mentioned the United Nations. I mentioned the 7th Soviet veto, which is a sufficient indication as to why it is impossible at this time to strengthen, to broaden, to develop the United Nations in the direction which he and I both wish.

It is utterly futile for the State Department, at this particular time, to propose that we should abolish the veto, that we should do this, that, and the other thing, when the time is not ripe for any such proposal. After all, American public opinion dominates, in the end, what the State Department does, and American public opinion is not ready at this stage of the world, when we are its chief source of financial aid, to permit the rest of the world to veto our withdrawal of that aid, at some time, we should feel

that that withdrawal was necessary. (Applause.)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Cousins wants to rejoin you, there.

Mr. Cousins: I'm not so sure about the fact that the American people are not ready, Mr. Kaltenborn. (Applause.) I think the strongest political reality in the United States right now is that the American people believe that only through UN can you have real peace. (Applause.)

I think the American people believe that the job should have been done at San Francisco, that those who say that now is not the time are those who always have said that now is not the time. (Applause.)

I believe the figure is 65 per cent, according to the Roper Poll. Until such time as we ourselves make a proposal for world government, we cannot, in good faith, speculate as to what others will do.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Cousins. But now is the time for us to call a halt on this part of the discussion, and while our speakers prepare their summaries of tonight's question, here is a special message of interest to you.

Announcer: Friends, I wonder if you realize how widely the Town Meeting idea is at work in this country and abroad? We've told you about the five foreign countries that have Town Meetings of their own regularly. We have told you about the Colum-

bus, Ohio, Town Meeting, now in its tenth year.

Last week, in Akron, Ohio, Mr. Denny was invited to preside over a Town Meeting that grew out of a dispute over the purposes and administration of the Akron Community Chest. The directors of the Community Fund invited principal leaders, critical of its administration to participate in a free and open Town Meeting over the radio before an audience of representative citizens. It was conducted in the pattern of the Town Meeting you've just heard, and was broadcast over Station WAKR, Akron.

The *Akron Beacon Journal* stated the following morning that the victory, if any, was in the fact that differences of opinion could be and were thoroughly aired.

The Town Meeting method is a part of your heritage. Are you making full use of it?

Now for the summaries of tonight's discussion, here is Mr. Denny.

Mr. Denny: First, let's hear from Mr. Cousins.

Mr. Cousins: Certainly, I believe there is hope for Europe. The Marshall Plan proves that the American people are ready to accept the full responsibility for peace. Now at the risk of sounding like a broken record, I'd like to say, "But this is not enough."

I think, to repeat, we must have a double-barreled foreign policy. While we cannot sacrifice any

physical strength, we must also build this moral and political offensive in the world around the idea of a rejuvenated and bolstered United Nations. The fate of both Russia and the United States may very well be decided by the billion and a half people outside both countries. Only a foreign policy that captures the hopes and imaginations of mankind can be termed a foreign policy worthy of American democracy. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Cousins. Now, Mr. Shirer, please.

Mr. Shirer: The answer to our question certainly is that there is a good deal of hope for Europe. Though I respect Mr. Cousins' view, I, as a reporter, would say that the hope of Europeans does not yet lie in the UN or in world government. It lies in themselves and in us. When they feel that they can get through these next five years, if they can produce enough to eat, and raise their living standards, if they can get peace for that time, then there is a great hope for them. This means there's hope for us. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Shirer. Now, Paul Manning.

Mr. Manning: I would like to say to Mr. Cousins that I do not deride the United Nations completely. The theory is fine; one would even quarrel with it. But I'd like to say to Mr. Cousins and leave this thought with you.

We are confronted by the fact of an aggressive Russia, fully armed, at the very door of Western Europe, and she's driven by a fanatic ideology, the very essence of which is the denial of compromise. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Kaltenborn, it's your turn for a final summary.

Mr. Kaltenborn: To me, the essence of tonight's discussion is our common agreement. Not one word of appeasement has been spoken. That's progress. (*Applause.*)

We are agreed that there must be sound preparedness, moral preparedness through support of the United Nations, physical preparedness, by way of armaments.

We are agreed that there must be a continuance of American help for Europe—America, out of her plenty, giving to Europe in her need.

We are agreed that we must work together for the common purpose of preserving peace, but reserving it through strength—not weakness. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Kaltenborn, Norman Cousins, William L. Shirer, and Paul Manning. Next week, Tuesday, November 2, as you know, is Election Day. We hope you'll all go to the polls and, then, that you'll listen to ABC all evening to a special televised program on the election returns which

begins at 7:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time.

ABC will cover the election from Washington, New York, Chicago, and by special pickups directly from hotly contested areas throughout the country, as well as direct from party headquarters.

All the ABC commentators will be on hand, Walter Winchell, Drew Pearson, Elmer Davis, Earl Godwin, Martin Agronsky, and Baukhage. Mr. George Gallup will analyze the returns as they come in, so be sure to stay tuned to your ABC station next Tuesday night when Town Meeting will give way to this great Election Day coverage.

The following week, November 9, Town Meeting will be back on the air with a discussion of a major domestic problem which we, the American people, must work out individually and collectively. The subject will be "What Should We Do About Race Segregation?" The speakers will be Walter White, executive secretary for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Hodding Carter, editor and publisher of the *Democrat Delta-Times* of Greenville, Mississippi; and Raymond Sprigle, staff member of *Pittsburgh Post Gazette*, and one other speaker to be announced. So be sure to plan to be with us every Tuesday night at the sound of the Crier's bell.

Concerning Town Hall

WHEN NEXT YOU COME TO NEW YORK VISIT FAMOUS TOWN HALL



This internationally-known sign hangs in front of one of the landmarks of New York—a handsome Georgian-style building designed by the great architectural firm of McKim, Mead and White. Half a block from Times Square, heart of the theatre district, Town Hall is within walking distance of most leading hotels and shops. All subways are near and taxi-drivers need only to be told, "Town Hall!"



AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING—now regularly on Television (as well as Radio)—originates from Town Hall on Tuesdays throughout the winter season. (During the sunny months of the year, as many of you know, it travels the length and breadth of the United States.) Tickets to Broadcast-Telecasts are free. Stop in or, better still, write in advance.



MUSIC—More musical events are held annually in Town Hall than in any other concert hall in the world. Such musical greats as Lotte Lehmann, Yehudi and Hepzibah Menuhin, Marian Anderson, Aksel Schiotz and Nelson Eddy have made their American recital debuts here. When planning a trip to New York write for the monthly Calendar of Events.



LECTURES—Town Hall's world-famous Morning Lectures, in their 55th season, run from November through April. Leaders of thought and opinion are heard Mondays, Wednesdays and Saturdays at 11. Although sold by subscription most in advance, a few single admissions are almost always available.

FOR INFORMATION IN CONNECTION WITH YOUR VISIT TO NEW YORK, WRITE: PUBLIC RELATIONS DIRECTOR, TOWN HALL, NEW YORK 18, N.Y. LUXemburg 2-2424